

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-29 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1 and 23 are amended. No new matter is added.

Applicants appreciate the courtesies shown to Applicants' representative by Examiner Pesin in the February 1, 2006 personal interview. Applicants' separate record of the substance of the interview is incorporated into the following remarks.

**I. Support for Claim Amendments**

Claims 1 and 23 are further amended to clarify that the projector recited in the claims has a single structure to comply with the Examiner's helpful suggestions made during the interview. Specifically, independent claims 1 and 23 are amended to recite "an internal image data generating portion," and "an internal image generating device," respectively. Support for the amendments to claims 1 and 23 can be found at least in Fig. 2 and the corresponding description. Thus, no new matter is added.

**II. The Title Is Descriptive**

The October 6, 2005 Office Action objects to the title for not being descriptive. As agreed during the personal interview, the title, as amended in the January 6, 2006 Amendment, is descriptive. Withdrawal of the objection is thus respectfully requested.

**III. The Claims Satisfy All Formal Requirements**

The October 6, 2005 Office Action objects to claims 13 and 19. As agreed during the personal interview, claim 13, as amended in the January 6, 2006 Amendment, satisfies all formal requirements. Thus, claim 13 and claim 19, depending therefrom, satisfy all formal requirements. Withdrawal of the objection is thus respectfully requested.

**IV. Claims 27 and 29 Satisfy The Requirements of 37 C.F.R. §1.75(c)**

The October 6, 2005 Office Action objects to claims 27 and 29 under 37 C.F.R. §1.75(c). As agreed during the personal interview, claims 27 and 29, as amended in the January 6, 2006 Amendment, satisfy the requirements of 37 C.F.R. §1.75(c). Withdrawal of the objection is thus respectfully requested.

**V. Claims 21 and 26 Satisfy the Requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112, 2<sup>nd</sup> Paragraph**

The October 6, 2005 Office Action rejects claims 21 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph for being indefinite. As agreed during the personal interview, claims 21 and 26, as amended in the January 6, 2006 Amendment, satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Withdrawal of the rejection is thus respectfully requested.

**VI. The Claims Define Patentable Subject Matter**

**A. §102(b) Rejection of Claims 1-12 and 21-29**

The October 6, 2005 Office Action rejects claims 1-12 and 21-29 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 6,005,534 to Hylin et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As argued during the personal interview, claims 1-12 and 21-29 are not anticipated by Hylin. First, as argued during the personal interview, and in the January 6, 2006 Amendment, Hylin only relates to a combined configuration of computers and projectors. Thus, Hylin does not disclose a projector connected to a network that includes an "an internal image data generating portion," as recited in independent claim 1, and as similarly recited in independent claim 23.

Second, Hylin does not disclose "a display screen data generating device, ..., to execute operations in response to a request from the projector and to generate display screen data," as recited in independent claim 23. Further, Hylin does not disclose "executing an application in response to a request from a client in a server connected to the network," as recited in independent claim 26, and "transmitting the multimedia data requested by way of a

client request to the requesting client and the projector in a server connected to the network," as recited in independent claim 28. Namely, the projector recited in independent claims 23, 26 and 28, are capable of requesting image data to be projected.

The combined configuration of a computer and a projector in Hylin only enables a projector to project a project image data received from a station computer (col. 5, line 60 - col. 6, line 12). Thus, the projector of Hylin is not capable of requesting image data to be projector.

Finally, Hylin not disclose "generating image data for display on the basis of the received user interface data in the projector," as recited in independent claim 26. Similarly, Hylin does not disclose "loading a suitable application for playback of the received multimedia data in the projector," as recited in independent claim 28. The projector recited in claims 26 and 28 is configured to receive image data of application programs, which it processes in an application server, via a network, and to project the received image data. Thus, the image data generation and application load must occur in the projector.

As discussed above, the combined configuration of a computer and a projector in Hylin only enables a projector to project a project image data received from a station computer. Thus, Hylin does not disclose a projector that generates image data and loads a suitable application, as recited in independent claims 26 and 28.

Thus, for at least these reasons, independent claims 1, 23, 26 and 28 are patentable over Hylin. Further, claims 2-12, 21, 22, 24, 25, 27 and 29, which variously depend from claims 1, 23, 26 and 28, are also patentable over Hylin, for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claims 1, 23, 26 and 28, as well as for the additional features they recite. Withdrawal of the rejection is thus respectfully requested.

**B. §103(a) Rejection of Claims 13 and 14**

The October 6, 2005 Office Action rejects claims 13 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Hylin in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,785,814 to Usami et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 13 and 14 would not have been rendered obvious by Hylin in view of Usami. Usami does not remedy the deficiencies of Usami discussed with respect to claim 1. Usami is cited by the Office Action for its alleged teaching of appending date/time information to image data. Claims 13 and 14 depend from claim 1. Thus, claims 13 and 14 are patentable over Hylin and Usami for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1, as well as for the additional features they recite. Withdrawal of the rejection is thus respectfully requested.

**C. §103(a) Rejection of Claims 15-20**

The October 6, 2005 Office Action rejects claims 15-20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Hylin in view of Usami and in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,615,239 to Berstis. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 15-20 would not have been rendered obvious by Hylin in view of Usami and Berstis. Berstis does not remedy the deficiencies of Hylin and Usami discussed with respect to claim 1. Berstis is cited by the Office Action for its alleged teaching of a configuration that handles HTML data. Claims 15-20 variously depend from claim 1. Thus, claims 15-20 are patentable over Hylin, Usami and Berstis for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1, as well as for the additional features they recite. Withdrawal of the rejection is thus respectfully requested.

**VII. Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

  
James A. Oliff  
Registration No. 27,075

Randi B. Isaacs  
Registration No. 56,046

Holly N. Moore  
Registration No. 50,212

JAO:RBI:HNM/axl

Date: February 27, 2006

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 19928**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--